



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,526	03/30/2007	Francesco Nicastro	P/2528-41	2065
2352 7590 04/30/2008 OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403				
EXAMINER				
SHECHTMAN, SEAN P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2121				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/580,526

Applicant(s)

NICASTRO, FRANCESCO

Examiner

Sean P. Shechtman

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

A1) determining, during cutting of an article, the characteristic energy and extrapolating a future time pattern of the characteristic energy (see embodiment on page 6, lines 6-14 of the instant specification).

A2) determining, during cutting of an article, the characteristic force, stress, pressure, impact, or acceleration and extrapolating a future time pattern of the characteristic force, stress, pressure, impact, or acceleration (see embodiment on page 6, lines 15-17, 21-25 of the instant specification).

A3) determining, during cutting of an article, the characteristic vibration and extrapolating a future time pattern of the characteristic vibration (see embodiment on page 6, lines 18-21 of the instant specification).

B1) feeding articles, scissor cut by the cutting unit (see embodiment on page 5, lines 19-22 of the instant specification).

B2) feeding articles, nip-off cut by the cutting unit (see embodiment on page 5, lines 17-19 of the instant specification).

C1) compensating the characteristic quantity, during cutting of the article, as a function of the operating temperature of the cutting unit (see embodiment on page 9, lines 10-22 of the instant specification).

C2) compensating the characteristic quantity, during cutting of the article, as a function of the operating speed of the cutting unit (see embodiment on page 9, line 22 – page 10, line 2 of the instant specification).

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

2. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

A1) claim 2.

A2) claim 4.

A3) claim 5.

The following claim(s) generic to A: claim 1.

B1) claim 31.

Art Unit: 2121

B2) claim 32.

The following claim(s) are generic to B: claims 1, 30.

C1) claim 43.

C2) claim 44.

The following claim(s) are generic to C: claims 1, 42.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The special technical feature of A1 is the determining, during cutting of an article, the characteristic energy extrapolating a future time pattern of the characteristic energy, while the special technical feature of A2 is the determining, during cutting of an article, the characteristic force, stress, pressure, impact, or acceleration and extrapolating a future time pattern of the characteristic force, stress, pressure, impact, or acceleration, while the special technical feature of A3 is the determining, during cutting of an article, the characteristic vibration extrapolating a future time pattern of the characteristic vibration. Since the special technical feature of the A1 invention is not present in the A2 claims, the special technical feature of the A2 invention is not present in the A1 claims, the special technical feature of the A1 invention is not present in the A3 claims, the special technical feature of the A3 invention is not present in the A1 claims, the special technical feature of the A2 invention is not present in the A3 claims, the special technical feature of the A3 invention is not present in the A1 claims, unity of invention is lacking.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The special technical feature of B1 is the feeding articles, scissor cut by the cutting unit, while the special technical feature of B2 is the feeding articles, nip-off cut by the cutting unit. Since the special technical feature of the B1 invention is not present in the B2 claims and the special technical feature of the B2 invention is not present in the B1 claims, unity of invention is lacking.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The special technical feature of C1 is the compensating the characteristic quantity, during cutting of the article, as a function of the operating temperature of the cutting unit, while the special technical feature of C2 is the compensating the characteristic quantity, during cutting of the article, as a function of the operating speed of the cutting unit. Since the special technical feature of the C1 invention is not present in the C2 claims and the special technical feature of the C2 invention is not present in the C1 claims, unity of invention is lacking.

3. A telephone call was made to Max Moskowitz on April 28, 2008 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean P. Shechtman whose telephone number is (571) 272-3754. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am-6:00pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo P. Picard can be reached on (571) 272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2121

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SPS

Sean P. Shechtman

April 28, 2008

/Sean P. Shechtman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2121